

REMARKS

There are 8 claims pending in the application. Applicant has amended claim 1 and has cancelled claims 9-35.

Applicant has cancelled claims 9-35 to expedite examination and reserves the right to file the cancelled claims in a continuation application at a later date. Cancellation of these claims should not be construed as agreement with the Examiner's objections.

Applicant is filing a Request for an Extension of Time and a Request for Continued Examination along with this response.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-8 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Levosky. In the Examiner's rejection, to claim 1, Examiner has noted that Levosky teaches the creation of aliases in response to the creation of new websites that become available. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the teachings of Levosky, and notes that Claim 1 required the generation of a new webpage instead of a new website, Applicant has amended claim 1 so that the request interface is responsive to an identity management system. Applicant respectfully submits that Levosky does not teach the use of an identity management system, and as such, cannot be considered to be anticipatory of the matter of claim 1 as amended.

Applicant notes that Claim 1, as amended, thus overcomes the rejection under 35 USC 102(e), and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that claims 2 and 4-8 all depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly. As such, Applicant notes that claims 2 and 4-8 include all the limitations of claim 1 and as claim 1 is submitted to be novel in view of the Levosky reference, it is submitted that claims 2 and 4-8 are also novel. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claims 2 and 4-8 be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 as being obvious in view of the combination of Levosky and Rounthwaite under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant submits that Levosky does not teach the use of a request interface responsive to an identity management system, as detailed in the commentary above with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that Rounthwaite does not teach the use of a request interface responsive to an Identity Management system, and as such

Application Serial No. 10/713,100

Amendment Dated: December 14, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: June 14, 2007

notes that the combination of Levosky and Rounthwaite, taken together, do not teach the use of a request interface responsive to an identity management system.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 3, which depends on claim 1, cannot be taken to be obvious in view of the combination of Rounthwaite and Levosky. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-35 under 35 USC 102(e). Applicant has cancelled these claims to expedite prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to file a continuation application on the basis of these claims. In view of the cancellation of these claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 9-35 under 35 USC 102(e) is now moot, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the claims presently pending are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the application proceed accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,
HARDT, Dick C.

By: /Dilip C. Andrade/
Dilip C. Andrade
Reg. No. 53,942
Perley-Robertson Hill & McDougall LLP
1400-340 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 0A5
CANADA
Tel: (613) 566-2270
Fax: (613) 238-8775
Email: dandrade@perlaw.ca